

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 25, 2004, claims 1-16 and 24-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwick et al. ("Using Microsoft Outlook 2000"), hereinafter "Padwick in view of Srivastava et al. (US Patent No. 6,549,922), hereinafter "Srivastava". Additionally, claims 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Srivastava.

Claims 2-8, 10, 12-16 and 18-37 have been canceled without prejudice, claims 1, 9, 11 and 17 are currently amended. Claims 38-42 introduced in the response filed on September 27, 2004 have also been cancelled. Claims 43-74 are newly presented. Thus, claims 1, 9, 11, 17 and 43-74 are pending. Applicant submits no new matter has been added.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the subject Office Action, claims 1-16 and 24-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwick in view of Srivastava.

Rejections against claims 2-8, 10, 12-16 and 24-37 have been rendered moot by their cancellations.

Claim 1 has been amended to clearly require the rendering of metadata of a first and a second metadata record of a first and a second audio or video content file of a first and a second genre, be effectuated using a first and second display layout, respectively, where the first and second display layouts having at least one common first display component set.

Applicants submit these required elements are neither taught nor suggested by Padwick and Srivastav, individually or in combination. Padwick merely teaches items having item types, such as calendar items, email items and so forth, and the items of each item types may be viewed in any one of a number of corresponding views. However, Padwick did not teach or suggest forming the views with "view component sets", nor forming views of different item types with cross item types common "view component sets" (assuming Padwick's item types may be considered as synonymous with "genres of content files" recited in claim 1, a consideration Applicants do not agree,

but need not address at the present time). Srivastav fails to remedy this deficiency in teaching.

Thus, claim 1 is not obvious, and patentable over Padwick and Srivastav, individually or in combination.

Claim 9 has been amended to clearly require the assigning of a new value to corresponding metadata fields of each other metadata record corresponding to the other content files of a genre, where the new value is received for the corresponding metadata field of a metadata record of a corresponding content file of the genre.

Applicants submit these required elements are neither taught nor suggested by Padwick and Srivastav, individually or in combination. As discussed earlier, Padwick merely teaches items having item types, such as calendar items, email items and so forth, and the items of each item types may be viewed in any one of a number of corresponding views. However, Padwick did not teach or suggest the assignment of a new value to each corresponding field of each other record of the same item type, based on the new value received for the corresponding field for an item of an item type (assuming Padwick's item types may be considered as synonymous with "genres of content files" recited in claim 9, a consideration Applicants do not agree, but need not address at the present time). Srivastav fails to remedy this deficiency in teaching.

Thus, claim 9 is not obvious, and patentable over Padwick and Srivastav, individually or in combination.

Claim 11 contains in substance the same limitations discussed earlier for claim 9. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 11 is not obvious, and patentable over Padwick and Srivastav, individually or in combination.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 17-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Srivastava.

Rejections of claim 18-23 have been rendered moot by their cancellations.

Claims 17 has been amended to include in substance the same limitations discussed earlier for claims 1 and 9. As discussed earlier, Srivastav fails to remedy the discussed deficiencies of Padwick.

Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 17 is not anticipated, and patentable over Srivastav.

New Claims 43-74

New claims 43-62 are dependent on either claim 1, 9, 11 or 17, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 43-62 are patentable over the cited references.

New claims 63-74 are drafted to be clearly patentable over the cited references, which fail to anticipate or suggest at least one of the required limitations of independent claims 63, 67 and 71 as well as their respective dependant claims.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit claims 1, 9, 11, 17 and 43-74 are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393. A Fee Transmittal is enclosed in duplicate for fee processing purposes.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 12/29/04



Al AuYeung
Registration No. 35,432

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981